

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

United States District Court  
Southern District of Texas  
FILED

OCT 16 2000

MICHAEL N. MILBY CLERK

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

NATIONWIDE HOUSING SYSTEMS,  
INC.,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
CA-00-125

DEFENDANT'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER

TO THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

COMES NOW Nationwide Housing Systems, Inc. ("Nationwide"), Defendant in the above-entitled and numbered cause, and files this its First Amended Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint and Jury Trial Demand (the "Complaint"), respectfully stating as follows:

NATURE OF ACTION

In response to the unnumbered paragraph immediately preceding Paragraph 1 of the Complaint, to the extent necessary, Nationwide denies the allegations therein and denies that Plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief sought in this action.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Nationwide admits that Plaintiff purports to bring a cause of action pursuant to the statutory provisions cited in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint, but Nationwide denies that this suit is properly authorized or maintainable against it under any of the statutory provisions cited by Plaintiff.

2. Nationwide admits that the conduct upon which Plaintiff's claims are based allegedly occurred within the geographic jurisdiction of the Court.

### PARTIES

3. Nationwide admits that Plaintiff purports to bring this action pursuant to the statutory provisions cited in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint but denies that this suit is properly authorized or maintainable against it under any of the statutory provisions cited by Plaintiff.

4. Nationwide admits that, during the period relevant to Plaintiff's claim, it was a Texas corporation with operations in the State of Texas and that it employed at least 20 employees. Except as specifically admitted herein, Nationwide denies the allegations in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

5. Nationwide admits that it is engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended ("ADEA").

### CONCILIATION

6. Nationwide admits that the parties engaged in conciliation efforts but denies that it engaged in any unlawful employment practices.

### STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

7. Nationwide denies the allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint.

8. Nationwide denies the allegations in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

9. Nationwide denies the allegations in Paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

10. Except as expressly admitted above, Nationwide denies each and every allegation in the Complaint and demands strict proof thereof.



PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Nationwide denies that Plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief sought under Paragraphs A-F of its Prayer for Relief.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff's demand for a jury trial requires no response by Nationwide.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery based on the cause of action asserted in the Complaint because Plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery based on the cause of action asserted in the Complaint because Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part by the applicable statute of limitations and/or administrative filing deadlines.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery based on the cause of action asserted in the Complaint because James Stovall was not qualified for the position of General Manager.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery based on the cause of action asserted in the Complaint because each action taken or decision made by Nationwide in relation to James Stovall was done to serve and in furtherance of legitimate, non-discriminatory business purposes and/or, if an improper motive played a part in any action taken or decision made by Nationwide in relation to Plaintiff, the same action or decision would have been taken or made without regard to such motive.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery based on the cause of action asserted in the Complaint because James Stovall has failed to adequately mitigate damages as required by law.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery based on the cause of action asserted in the Complaint because Nationwide's actions were not willful within the meaning of the ADEA.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff is not entitled to recovery based on the cause of action asserted in the Complaint because, as part of a settlement agreement, any and all claims against Nationwide related to the conduct referenced in the Complaint were waived and released.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Defendant Nationwide Housing Systems, Inc. prays that Plaintiff take nothing upon final hearing or trial hereof; that this suit be dismissed on the merits with prejudice to the refiling of same; and that Nationwide be awarded its attorneys' fees and costs of court, together with such other and further relief, whether general or special, at law or in equity, to which it may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

By: William O. Ashcraft (with permission)  
Anita Alessandra

William O. Ashcraft, Esq.

Attorney-in-Charge

Texas Bar No. 01372800

Southern District of Texas No. 11654

Anita M. Alessandra, Esq.

Texas Bar No. 00988000

Southern District of Texas No. 13936

R. Jeff Worth, Esq.

Texas Bar No. 00795732

(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)



ASHCRAFT LAW FIRM  
8750 N. Central Expressway  
Suite 1070  
Dallas, Texas 75231  
Telephone: (214) 987-0660  
Facsimile: (214) 987-3847

Tom M. Harrison, Esq.  
Texas Bar No. 09122300  
Southern District of Texas No. 1891  
Roxana V. Shia, Esq.  
Texas Bar No. 00785146  
Southern District of Texas No. 15608  
HORNBLOWER, MANNING & WARD, P.C.  
711 North Carancahua, Suite 1810  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78475  
Telephone: (361) 888-8041  
Facsimile: (361) 888-8222

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT  
NATIONWIDE HOUSING SYSTEMS, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Defendant's First Amended Answer was served by certified mail, return receipt requested, upon counsel of record for Plaintiff on this 11th day of October 2000, as follows:

R. Chris Pittard, Esq.  
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION  
San Antonio District Office  
5410 Fredericksburg Road, Suite 200  
San Antonio, Texas 78229-3555

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Anita M. Alessandra